REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed March 31, 2003. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 2 – 27 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have added claims 25 - 27, have directly amended claims 2, 4 – 8, 12 and 14 – 17 and have canceled claim 1 without waiver, disclaimer or prejudice. Applicants have canceled claim 1 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of this canceled claim in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

The Office Action indicates that claims 1 – 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by *Ying*. Additionally, the Office Action indicates that claims 1 – 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Flowers* in view of www.graphxedge.com. With respect to claim 1, Applicants have canceled this claim without waiver, disclaimer or prejudice as set forth above and respectfully assert that the rejection as to this claim has been rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as set forth in detail below.

With respect to the www.graphxedge.com web site, Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action has not made a prima facie showing that the information contained in that web site qualifies as prior art. Specifically, there is nothing to indicate that the subject matter currently disclosed at the web site was publicly available more than one year prior to the

filing date of the pending application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are improper and should be removed.

With respect to claim 7, the claim recites:

> 7. (Currently Amended) A method for distributing and installing print device fonts, the method comprising:
> maintaining a web site which facilitates selection from a set of print device-ready fonts;
> through the web site, obtaining information concerning a visitor's system configuration;
> through the web site, permitting selection from a set of compatible fonts within said set of print device-ready fonts, compatibility being determined based upon said information concerning a visitor's system configuration;
> from the web site, authorizing transfer of a selected one or multiple ones of said set of compatible fonts; and
> from the web site, installing said selected one or multiple ones of said set of compatible fonts on a visitor's print device; and
> ***displaying potential estimated performance gains which may result from the purchase of a font selected by a visitor.***
> (Emphasis Added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Ying* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 7, because Ying does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features emphasized above in claim 7. Specifically, *Ying* does not teach or disclose "displaying potential estimated performance gains which may result from the purchase of a font selected by a visitor." Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection of claim 7 is no longer proper and requests that claim 7 be placed in condition for allowance. Since claims 8, 12, 14,15 and 25 use claim 7 as a base claim, Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims also are in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 16, that claim recites:

> 16. (Currently Amended) A method for distributing print device fonts, the method comprising:
>
> guiding, through a web site, a visitor through selection of one or more fonts compatible with a system configuration of the visitor;
>
> ***determining a visitor's system configuration;***
>
> ***displaying potential estimated performance gains resulting from installation of a selected font based upon the visitor's system configuration;***
>
> offering to sell, through the web site, one or more fonts compatible with the system configuration of the visitor; and
>
> from the web site, in response to a purchase by a visitor, installing said selected one or multiple ones of said set of compatible fonts on a visitor's print device.
>
> (Emphasis Added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Ying* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 16, because Ying does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features emphasized above in claim 16. Specifically, *Ying* does not teach or disclose "determining a visitor's system configuration," or "displaying potential estimated performance gains resulting from installation of a selected font based upon the visitor's system configuration." Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection of claim 16 is no longer proper and requests that claim 16 be placed in condition for allowance. Since claim 26 uses claim 16 as a base claim, Applicant respectfully asserts that this claim is also in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 17, that claim recites:

> 17. (Currently Amended) A web site for distributing print device fonts, the web site being accessible over the Internet and comprising software for:
>
> permitting a visitor to select fonts compatible with that visitor's system configuration;
>
> ***displaying potential estimated performance gains which may result from installation of a font selected by the visitor;***
>
> determining whether to authorize installation of a selected one or selected multiple compatible fonts; and
>
> installing said selected one or selected multiple compatible fonts on a visitor's print device in response to an authorization determined in said step of determining.
>
> (Emphasis Added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Ying* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 17, because Ying does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features emphasized above in claim 17. Specifically, *Ying* does not teach or disclose "displaying potential estimated performance gains which may result from installation of a font selected by the visitor." Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection of claim 17 is no longer proper and requests that claim 17 be placed in condition for allowance. Since claims 18 – 22 and 27 use claim 17 as a base claim, Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims also are in condition for allowance.

Newly Added Claims

In this Response, Applicants have added claims 25 – 27. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are allowable for at least the reason that they each depend from an allowable claim as described above.

Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 2 – 27 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

M. Paul Qualey, Jr., Reg. No. 43, 024

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
100 Galleria Parkway N.W., Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington D.C. 20231, on 5/9/03.

Stephanie Riley
Signature